UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/564,225	05/23/2006	Matthias Wellhoefer	10191/4159	7449	
26646 KENYON & K	7590 01/05/200 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER			
ONE BROADV NEW YORK, N		AMRANY, ADI			
NEW TORK, P	N1 10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2836		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/05/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/564,225	WELLHOEFER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ADI AMRANY	2836		

	ADI AMRANY	2836	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>11 December 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THI			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origiten than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	Called
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co			cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in beauppeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ottod oldiirio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			,
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	kplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>9-27</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).  13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Stephen W Jackson/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 2836	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendment to claim 9 (taked from claim 20) is identical to the limitations of claim 14, which was rejected in view of Schumacher. Amending claim 9 to include the limitations of claim 20 does not overcome the rejection of claims 9 and 14.

Applicants' argument that the references do not disclose a housing is not persuasive. It is obvious that electronics require a housing to shield internal components from outside elements. Further, as discussed in the final rejection (September 25, 2008), the vehicle itself can be considered the housing. Claim 9 does not recite that the switch is inside the housing. This limitation is only presented in dependent claim 10.

Contrary to applicants' remarks, the motivation to combine APA and Schumacher were provided in the final rejection (last 3 lines of page 5 and the first 2 lines of page 6).

Applicants' arguments (Remarks pages 7-8) regarding the positioning of sensors 2 and 3 relative to the housing (10), it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to redraw the boundaries of the housing. Further, as discussed above, the claims do not exclude the vehicle from being considered as the housing.

Applicants' remaining arguments are not persuasive. Applicants' remaining arguments simply list every available reply to a §103 rejection. Claim 9 is written in very broad terminology that opens the claim to interpretaions that may not seem consistent with applicants' intentions. The combination of APA and Schumacher and APA and Mazur were properly presented as a §103 rejection. The combinations do not destroy the functionality or teach away from the disclosed devices of Schumacher and Mazur.